

Transportation Investment Forum – Session Three **Flip Chart Responses to Breakout Session Questions**

Question One:

Considering the information that you heard this morning, does this view of Idaho's long-term transportation needs support your vision of Idaho's future – particularly in regard to your geographical region or the sector that you represent? Why or why not?

Meet Vision – Yes / No	Why?	Why Not?
Not quite	Presenters covered land use <u>and</u> economic conditions	Projects focus on moving people – more on urban / tourist , less on natural resources
It's a move in the right direction.	Identification of regional needs is positive	More “top-of-mind” Too past-oriented – needs to be innovative and plan for a future. This is a starting point.
Not really – we need a <i>preferred</i> future	Yes, for the question asked	More involvement at local level in some districts than in others
Yes		But need more emphasis on rail and air
Yes and No		Demographics on new people coming in – Families? Education level?
No	Big list	Movement of freight and goods - Freight is a drive-thru business System maintenance costs Greater focus on rural Need to integrate CTAC transportation plans into this Transit projections are low process Don't want any more growth Doesn't separate “wants” from “needs” Doesn't seem integrated with other modes (air, rail, other) Fiscal restraints. We need to address costs up front Inflated? Doesn't include other factors – ITS Local projects not complete / accurate Too many “wants” Pent-up demand vs. future needs Needs are greater than what is shown – O & M is missing Too much subjectivity Doesn't include everything Same approach to problem – too many “road” solutions. We need to think about other solutions. No date to integrate new solutions. Can't project 30 years out... may be inflated Not all needs are accounted for

Question Two:

What are all of the factors, such as safety, economic growth, air quality, etc., that should be considered as we prioritize our wants and needs?

Popularity of Response	Factors for Consideration
*	Scheduling
****	Fits into long-term growth
*	Balance reality with vision
**	Address the needs of all people
**	Leveraging federal funding sources, i.e., Medicaid
*****	Funding / How to Pay
**	Environmental Impact
*	Changing demographics
*	Regional significance
**	Multi-modal solutions / Considering all possible modes
*****	Cost / Benefit ratios
**	Ask: Is this a project or a solution?
*****	Safety
***	Congestion relief
***	Circulation (system-wide)
***	Facilities commerce
**	Economic development in rural areas
****	Population and system use
*****	Air quality / Changes in Emissions
**	Water quality
*	Providing acceptable level of service
**	Facilitate tourism

**	Consider the supply of resources
*	Compliance (federal, state and other)
*****	Economic growth & development
*	Sustainability issues
*****	Infrastructure
*****	Quality of life
*	Free movement through areas
*	Esthetics
*	North/South and East/West transportation corridors
**	Preserve recreation (hunting, fishing, etc.)
*	Dealing with difficult geography or terrain
*	Access to fuel
*	Changing technology / Maximizing use of technology
*	Historical precedents
*	Making decisions that add most value
*	Self-funded transportation
*****	Linking land use and transportation
***	Moving freight to rail / Efficient rail movement
****	Multiple uses of same infrastructure
****	Consolidation of inter-modal transportation planning
*	Use of scenario planning
**	Public transit needs of rural areas
*	Consideration of community values

QUESTION THREE:

What will be the reaction from your region to the information presented?

Supportive / Positive?	Not Supportive / Negative?	Other?
Project list	Some projects	Sticker shock
Process	Not as visionary as it could be	Depends on solution
Aggressive solutions	Concern = Price Tag	Need to “get” the vision
Understands that there’s a need	Others not consulted on this plan (small hwy districts without their own plans).	Need education to gain support
Identifies a district-level wish list	Smart Growth Idaho – Perspective that the only solution is to widen roads. We need a broader base of solutions.	Need to understand reality
COMPASS – positive, but needs to see identify an overall vision	Sticker shock	Can they see “value”?
Production Agriculture – roads for commerce		With more roads, will maintenance costs increase?
FHWA – eligible for federal funding – supportive		There’s a need for buy-in from stakeholders and the public.
Twin Falls Region – supportive, but small rural areas are not represented		They’ll say, “I wish I would have known about this study. I would have participated.”
Would be supportive if the priority criteria we identified is used to evaluate		Paving roads at U. of I. is of no benefit to agriculture or commerce
		We want.... But there's not enough money.

QUESTION FOUR:

What improvements can be made to the information gathered and the documents provided?

- Map data, with regions and more detail
- O&M included in cost data
- Priorities
- Ranking of existing needs today and ranking of future growth needs
- Schedule projects
- How will this information be used?
- More accurate information
- Projects divided by purpose / justification
- Infrastructure plan with bullets reflecting factors and plan
- We need to see the “vision” for each region as well as state-wide
- Answer the question “What’s in it for me?”
- Perspectives on long-term funding, broken down into smaller steps / projects
- Work from the bottom up (e.g., highway districts)
- Build community interest
- Are business and employer concerns represented here?
- Need to gather information from economic builders
- What are the local and state policies that keep land and transportation apart?
- System maintenance costs
- Need to know *who* filled out the questionnaires
- Need more stakeholder involvement
- Dispel the perception that this plan is driven by “the players.”
- This should be looked at as a process.... not a project.
- Keep equating the \$20 billion with 30 years
- How will this document be used? As a starting point?
- E-mail information to us

QUESTION FIVE:

What information do you need to participate in the next meeting?

- Compare to known funding available; identify gaps
- Allocation of sales taxes throughout the state. How much goes to transportation?
- Clear direction in focus of next meeting
- Comparative information on the use of fees in other states
- What happens if there is no more money?
- Breakdown of what exactly will be funded
- Put the 2 or 3 funding studies that have already been done on the web
- Information on who pays for the plan
- More information on how the transportation modes will work together
- Include information on the Port of Lewiston
- Budget totals for the past 3 years – where the money comes from and goes to
- Projected revenue stream for the next 30 years and projected maintenance costs
- Examples of what other states are doing and/or presentations by other states
- Split of how state funds are spent on different modes and how they compare to other states
- The notes from the January meeting
- If referring to a study, please make sure we are given a copy
- Transit: Operating needs vs. Capital needs

HOLDING TANK

We need a standardized nomenclature

We need to separate *needs* from *wants*